DETAILED ACTION

- A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/3/08 has been entered.

- Claims 1, 3-8, 10-12, 14-19, 21, 22, 24-29, 31, and 33 are presented for further examination.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-8, 10-12, 14-19, 21, 22, 24-29, 31, and 33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 22, 24-29, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In Claim 22, "computer readable medium" is merely direct to signal per se. Applicant intended the computer readable medium to be "network circuits" as well as "network link". Thus, Claims 22, 24-29, and 31 are failed to be limited to embodiments which fall within a statutory category.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 29, 31, and 33 are rejected under

35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Garcia et al hereinafter Garcia (US2003/0048470).

1. Referring to Claims 1, 11, 12, 22 and 33, Garcia disclosed a HyperText Transport Protocol

(HTTP) data generator within printer (the printer must have generator in order to interpret the

HTTP data that the web browser receive from the internet, refer to 0016 and 0017), for including

status information of the printer in HTTP data for transmission to a HTTP browser on a remote

terminal (various computers can perform tasks with the printer, refer to 0020, 0021, and 0033),

wherein the HTTP browser on the remote terminal provides access to the printer status

information (status information can be emailed to the recipient, refer to 0033); a HTTP browser

within the printer, communicatively coupled to the HTTP data generator, for interpreting the

HTTP data generated for the HTTP browser on the remote terminal for display of the printer

status information on a display integral with the printer (in order to generate email or a simple

communication (refer to 0038 and 0020), HTTP protocol as indicate in 0016 and 0017, must

work with generator in order interpreting the HTTP data, and in order to sent out information

such as status information); and a display integral to the printer (refer to 0030), for displaying the

printer status information to an operator of the printer (refer to 0033).

2. Referring to Claims 4, 15 and 25, Garcia indicates wherein the step of generating the operator

display definition is performed in response to an operating parameter within the printer changing

independent of user input (refer to 0024 and 0031).

3. Referring to Claims 8 and 19, Garcia indicates accepting an operator input for the printer

through means associated with the operator interface display, and controlling a function within

the printer in response to the operator input (user enter commands, refer to 0017).

4. Referring to Claim 10, 21, 24, and 31, Garcia indicates wherein the step of accepting utilizes

at least one of a pointing device, a keyboard, handwriting recognition, and a touch screen input

(touch screen, refer to 0015).

5. Referring to Claim 29, Garcia indicates accepting an operator input associated with the display

integrated to the printer; and controlling a function within the printer in response to the operator

input (refer to 0015).

6. Referring to Claims 3, and 14, Garcia indicates wherein the HTTP data further includes data

for one or more of a video, an image, a sound file, and an animation display (video, refer to

0015).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5-7, 16-18, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Garcia et al hereinafter Garcia (US2003/0048470) in view of Miyoshi et al hereinafter Parry

(US 2002/0196460).

7. Referring to Claim 6, 17, and 27, Garcia disclosed wherein the step of generating the HTTP

data (refer to 0016)

Although Garcia disclosed the invention substantially as claim, Garcia is silent in regards to "the

HTTP data is performed periodically with a time period".

It is obvious of ordinary skill in the art that in order to retrieve web information such as by

utilizing URL of a particular web page, the browser constantly update the HTTP data which is

performed periodically with a time period.

8. Referring to Claims 7, 18, and 28, Garcia disclosed accessing the internet via web browser

(refer to 0017).

It is obvious of ordinary skill in the art that when by the time the web browser polls the HTTP

data from the internet destination, and the destination is no longer available, it would provides

the browser with an error information.

9. Referring to Claims 5, 16, and 26, Garcia indicates wherein the operating parameter (refer to Fig, settings).

Garcia is silent in regards "operating parameter is categorized as at least one of a priority parameter, a paper jam indicator and an out of paper indicator."

Parry disclosed "operating parameter is categorized as at least one of a priority parameter, a paper jam indicator and an out of paper indicator." (Priority, refer to 0053).

Hence, providing functions disclosed by Parry, would be desirable for a user to implement in order to allow increased control over print jobs which are pending and which have been processed and stored by a printer.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Garcia by including the features disclosed by Parry.

Conclusion

Examiner's Notes: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner. In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the

specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify

and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Karen C. Tang whose telephone number is (571)272-3116. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7 - 3.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information

for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information

about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access

to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197

(toll-free).

/Karen C Tang/

Examiner, Art Unit 2151

/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151